

PSAP FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

July 2, 2002
10:00 a.m.

Department of Information Technology
Conference Room, 3rd Floor
Richmond Plaza Building
110th South 7th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Members Present: Thomas Hanson, Chairman
Melvin Breeden
James Charron
Terry Hall

Members Present (via conference call):
James McDonnell
David Von Moll

Members absent: Melissa McDaniel
Susan Powles

Staff Present: Steve Marzolf, Coordinator
Dorothy Spears-Dean, Analyst
Brenda Bolton, Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hanson, Chairman, called the meeting of the PSAP Funding Subcommittee to order at 1000 hours.

PSAP FUNDING HISTORY

Mr. Marzolf presented to the Board a brief history of how the PSAP funding has been determined up until this date. Mr. Marzolf also presented the attached "Funding Projections".

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT

Mr. Hanson stated that the format of this meeting would be to obtain input from members of the subcommittee, as well as from those present in the audience.

Comments from Subcommittee Members:

1. Mr. Hall made the following requests for consideration:
 - a. LEC contact issues (getting prices)

- b. Increased long distance rates due to the call backs that are needed for wireless calls.
 - c. Uniform prices and extra costs for adding personnel for wireless.
 - d. Outdated equipment and necessary upgrades
 - e. New PSAPs expansion of number of positions
 - f. Longer call processing time due to wireless
 - g. Phase II technology issues with LEC with new wireless carriers
 - h. Wireline calls decreasing
2. Mr. Charron made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Mapping beyond technology – day to day management to maintain equipment and keep it running.
 - b. Measuring end to end call event process (end to end solution missing)
 - c. Account for the overlap between the time the calls are taken and entered.
 - d. Solution for call management (records management with the PSAP)
 - e. What determines level of performance standards?
3. Mr. Breeden made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Need to evaluate PSAP funding due to the large “pot” of money
 - b. The “pot” is being siphoned by other sources
 - c. Need to allow all possible PSAP support before money is gone
 - d. Need to spend the money on what it was originally intended
4. Mr. Marzolf made the following requests for consideration:
- a. State focus is on the state and multi-regional levels
 - b. Support inter-tandem trunking
 - c. Current infrastructure soon to change. Leading to region-based, not Jurisdiction-based.
 - d. Not included on “Funding Projections” attached sheet – additional costs for mapping project that have not yet been captured.
 - e. Policy has always been “what is good for one PSAP is good for all” – do not necessarily have to adhere to this policy when reevaluating.
 - f. Law only requires Phase 0
 - g. Do we make retroactive to FY2003?
5. Mr. McDonnell made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Need to take into consideration the possible need to change legislation

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Mr. Bob Nibarger, Virginia Beach made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Need for a full time engineer or advisor within the Division of Public Safety Communications
 - b. Need for a State media campaign, instructing the public of the proper use of wireless telephones and 911

- c. Expanding deployment of VDOT signage
 - d. Expanding the use of simulators for training
 - e. Maintenance – cell phones for ESN routing
 - f. Person/Training for analysis
 - g. Abandoned calls are a huge issue
 - h. Building projects (Back-up Center)
 - i. Possible third-party auditor that audits revenue from CMRS Providers
2. Mr. Wes Ashley, Martinsville-Henry made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Multi-jurisdiction PSAPs are limited
 - b. Data Manager needed
3. Mr. Howard Douthit, City of Norfolk made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Regional type of tandem
 - b. System administrator
 - c. Time extension of call to be included in cost recovery
 - d. Outgoing calls for wireless have increased
4. Mr. Pat Shumate, Roanoke County made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Opposes the state taking over wireline 911 (should remain in locality)
 - b. IT staff funding
 - c. Minimum of \$30,000 granted – 1 person for an 8-hour work day, when 24-hour day is what is needed.
 - d. Large number of administrative calls due to location (near I-81)
 - e. Maintenance costs are increasing
5. Mr. Ron Wade, City of Roanoke made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Opposed to statewide tax for wireline
 - b. Percentage for CAD or recorder maintenance costs (UPS)
6. Ms. Melinda Bramley, City of Virginia Beach made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Percentage of overall expenses
7. Ms. Ellen Davenport, Virginia Association of Counties made the following requests for consideration:
- a. Wireless Fund is sitting out there for use when state is in financial burden – need to protect (large balance attracts attention)
 - b. State study is presently being conducted regarding local and state telecommunication taxes. Seem to be focusing and questioning the E911 tax due to it being levied per cell phone rather than per household.
 - c. Ms. Davenport will notify PSAP Funding Subcommittee of when the next meeting of this study group will take place.

8. Mr. Pete Summer, City of Hampton made the following requests for consideration:

a. Concern of putting off action by subcommittee due to fund being a large target

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to be discussed, Mr. Hall made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breeden that the meeting be adjourned; passed 4-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda A. Bolton
Administrative Assistant
Public Safety Communications
Department of Technology Planning

Approved by subcommittee: _____
(date)